

GRAUSTARK

#283

27 January 1973

1771BB

"Fall 1910"

FRANCE CEDS PORTS TO ENGLAND

ENGLAND (Barson): F Mid-Por; F Eng-Bre; F Bel-Fog; F Nth & F Hel-hold; F Wes S FRANC F Lyc-Tyr; A Ber S A Mun; A Mun S A Kie-Ber; F Prus S A Kie-Ber; A Kie-Ber; F Liv S F Prus; F Sve-Bot; A St-P-Mos.

FRANCE (Holcombe): A Rom-Apu; F Nap-Ali; A Pl-Ven; A Mar-Tus; F Lyc C A Mar-Tus; F Tun-Ton; F Tyr S A Mar-Tus.

ITALY (Brooks): F Con-Leg; A Ven-holds; F Adr S A Ven; A Apu-Nap; F Ion S A Apu-Nap.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Trekert): A Mos-St. P; A War-Fru; A War-Gal; A Vie-Bot; A Sti S A Vie-Bot; A Rom-holds; A Tyr S ITALIAN A Ven; F Gre S ITALIAN F Ion.

Underlined moves are not possible. The High Combatant Powers now control the following supply centers:

ENGLAND: Bel, Ber, Br, Den, Edi, Hol, Kie, Liv, Lon, Mun, Nwy, Por, St-P, Sve. (14)

FRANCE: Mar, Nap, Par, Rom, Spa, Tun. (6)

ITALY: Ann, Con, Sve, Ven. (4)

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Bid, Bul, Gre, Mos, Mun, Ser, Sve, Tri, Vie, War. (10)

Austria-Hungary may build two new units and England may build one. France and Italy must each remove one unit. The deadline for these "Winter 1910" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 10 FEBRUARY 1973.

EDINBURGH (Ide release): The English government asserts that it must establish control over Portugal despite the accords of 1907. This was done in order to establish and land additional units in Germany. We hope that the use of the fleet in the Western Mediterranean will sus- (continued in the next column)

1972B

"Fall 1909"

NEW SULTAN CHANGES SIDES

ENGLAND (Abbott): F St.P(n.e.) S A Liv; F Prus S A Liv; A Liv & F Bel-S Fru; A Ruh-Mun; A Ber S A Ruh-Mun; A Bel-Ruh; F Kie, F Tyr, & F Eng-holds; F Wes & F Tun 3 P Tyr.

FRANCE (Lipson): A Ber S ENGLISH A Ruh-Mun; A Pl-Tyr; A Tus-Ven; A Mar-Pls; F Lyc S A Mar-Pls.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Frederick): A Ven-Tus; A Rom S A Ven-Tus; A Tyr-Ven; A Mun-Tyr; A Bob-Mun; A Gal-Sil; A Vie-TPl; F Gre S TURKISH F Ion.

TURKEY (Hendry): A War-Rum; A War-Gal; F Nap-holds; F Apa-Ven; A Mar-Dar; F Ion-holds; F Adr S F Apa-Ven.

Underlined moves are not possible. The French A Tus and the Austro-Hungarian A Mun are annihilated. The High Combatant Powers now control the following supply centers:

ENGLAND: Bel, Ber, Den, Edi, Hol, Kie, Liv, Lon, Mun, Nwy, St.P, Sve, Tun. (13)

FRANCE: Br, Mar, Par, Por, Spa. (5)

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Bid, Bul, Gre, Rom, Ser, Tri, Vie, War. (7)

TURKEY: Ank, Bul, Con, Mos, Nap, Rum, Sve, Svy, Ven. (9)

Turkey may build two new units, and England and France may each build one. The deadline for these "Win' 1909" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 10 FEBRUARY 1973.

One player has proposed a c. If all players send in their moves by the next deadline, it will be so agreed.

(continued from the previous page) The French in any region may have to make. With skill we may be able to move into the East where all centers may become sieg waiting from Paris.

1971

2

"Spring 1910"

ANGLO-GERMAN ALLIANCE CRACKS!

ENGLAND (Lipton): A Mar-Tus; F Lyo & A Mar-Tus; F Tyr S A Mar-Tus; F Wes S F Tyr; F Adr-Apu; F Ion S F Adr-Apu; F Mid-Per; A Spa S F Mid-Per; A Mos-Dev; A St-P-Mos; F Nth holds.

FRANCE (Ayres): A Por-Rom.

GERMANY (Berman): A Gal-Rum; A Tyr S A Gal-Rum; A Mun-Boh; A Sil S A Mun-Boh; A Ruh-Bel; A Tyr-Tri; A Ven S A Tyr-Tri; F Pru-Bal; A Ber-Pru; A Kie-Mun.

ITALY (Leeder): A Gre holds; A Smy-Con; A Rom S F Nap; F Nap S A Rom; F Tus-Tyr.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (S. Tesser): A Boh-Tyr; A Tri S A Boh-Tyr; A Vie & A Bud S A Tri; F Aeg-Ior.

RUSSIA (Barents): A Rum-Bul; A Ank-Con.

Underlined moves are not possible. The French A Per is annihilated. The German A Tyr and the Italian F Tus are both dislodged, and the only retreat possible for either is Piedmont. These players must send in BY IMMEDIATE RETURN MAIL their decision whether to retreat or remove the dislodged unit; if both retreat to Piedmont both will be removed. Other players may make their "Fall 1910" moves conditional on the outcome of this situation. Players will be informed as soon as the GameMaster hears from Leeder and Berman. The deadline for "Fall 1910" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 10 FEBRUARY 1973. Press releases are postponed to that issue.

1972

"Spring 1908"

A few misprints got into the recent issues. The French fleet reported in Lyo in #281 is actually in Wes, and the Russian army reported in Gal in the same issue is in War.

ENGLAND (Lipson): F Eng-Lon; F Spa(s.c.) holds.

FRANCE (Reit): F Tyr-Lyo; F Wes-Mid; F Liv-Cly; F Lon-Dix.

GERMANY (Buddleston): A Gas-Bre; A Ven S ENGLISH F Eng-Lon; F Bel-Nth; F St.P(n.c.)-Bar; F Nwy S F St.P(n.c.)-Bar; A Fin-St.P; A Mun-Boh; A Kie-Mun; A Pru-Sil; A Ber S A Pru-Sil.

ITALY (Ayres): A Nap-Rom.

RIA-HUNGARY (Honig): A Mar-Pie; A Tus-Rom; A Bud-Gal; A Vie S A Bud-Sil.

Prisco): F Nrg-Nth; A Sil-Pru; A Liv & A War S A Sil-Pru; A TURKISH A Rum-Bud.

say): A Rum-Bud; A Gal S A Rum-Bud; A Gre-Alb; F Tri S F Ven; F Tri; F Ion-Fun; F Aeg-Ton.

Retreats F Lon-Wei and the German A Pru is annihilated. If a Gal-Vic, -War, or -Sil, this retreat should be sent in by "Fall 1908" deadline at NOON, SATURDAY 10 FEBRUARY 1973.

THE DIPLOMATIC POUCH

[The first two letters are in response to the Gamesmaster's request for discussions by the players on 1971EE. This game was completed in GRAUSTARK #280. As always, comments by the Gamesmaster are in square brackets.]

PAUL J. WOOD, 24613 Harmon, St. Clair Shores, Mich. 48080: I could take Smyrna but I have a commitment to Bill Drakert to let him stay in until the end and I won't go back on it. I am only attacking Smyrna with one unit to keep him honest. I had even thought of continuing until I could grab all of England, but dismissed that idea: why get greedy? Dick has played a good game...

Thanks for taking care of Games & Puzzles for me, it sounds very interesting. Glad you pass along information like that to your subscribers.

[You're welcome. Games & Puzzles, a monthly, is the leading English publication in the field of simulation games including war games. Subscriptions are available through me at \$9 a year by surface mail and \$12 a year by air mail.]

BILL DRAKERT, 159 Cholson Road, White Plains, N. Y. 10603 [20 December 1972]: The Russians played well and consistently; the critical point of the game was in Fall 1905. The Turkish-Russian alliance had at that point completely destroyed Austria. While 'we' were making further plans a new (Italian-Russian) alliance formed and Turkey, naively and foolishly, left herself exposed to a devastating attack. The Italians, who had up to that time done nothing except vacillate (which may be their best policy) at that point apparently agreed to an alliance which left them second best! The Russians were, however, kind enough to let me survive to the end.

Not being closely involved in the West it appeared to me that France and Germany played inconsistently and England played well but had no chance once the Italians and Russians stuck together.

Had an English-Italian-Turkish remnant alliance been formed in 1906 the Russians could have been held.

Russia played consistently throughout and once Italy formed his alliance his play was completely coordinated with Russia.

[An Italian strategy of this sort was recommended in Games & Puzzles, which has a monthly column on Diplomacy. The column is currently surveying the best opening strategies for the various players.]

MICHEL LIESNARD, Avenue Evariste de Moersman 43, Berchem-Sto.-Agathe, B-1080 Bruxelles, Belgium [12 November 1972]: You certainly remember I wrote you, in early August, that "80% of the Belgians were in favour of McGovern". Now that Nixon has won, as foreseen, you'll perhaps be interested to know that I didn't overstate the truth: it is a custom, here in Brussels, that the entire American colony gathers every four years at the "Hilton" hotel for an "Election Nite". I was there too, like 500 other Belgians and 200 people from different European countries. At midnight (it was then 7 PM in New York and 3 PM in California, I think), ballot papers were distributed among the audience, the Americans taking the blue papers and the Europeans the red ones. Well, Nixon won with 75% of your compatriots' votes, while McGovern got 22% of the red ballots in his favour!

[A similar survey was run at the Foreign Press Center here in New York City on Election Day. The FPC, which is maintained by the US Information Service, took foreign correspondents around to various polling places, "then invited them to 'vote' for a President in a sample booth set up in the library. The reporters included Russians and Chinese. Their vote: Senator George McGovern, 57; President Nixon, 39; Linda J. Ness of the Socialist Workers (Trotskyite) 5; Guss Hall, the Communist

candidate, got no votes." - New York Times, 22 November 1972

[The news story, which dealt with the experiences of foreign correspondents here, also told the tale of a British reporter who filed a cablegram when President McKinley was shot at a fair in Buffalo, New York, in 1901. The cable read, "MCKINLEY SHOT BUFFALO". His home office replied, "WHY YOU WASTING CABLE CHARGES?"]

Something else: Belgium is now the first country in the world (at least I suppose it is...) where Diplomacy is officially taught in a municipal school. It started like this: in September, my head of school told me that he hadn't found a teacher to be in charge of the "chess courses" of the Tuesday afternoon. So he asked me if I could do it. "Yes," I answered, "but it would be much more interesting if we could also study Go, Tia• Ch'i, etc." He accepted, but I still needed a decision of the municipal council. I went there, explained them what these other games were, showed them a Dippy board and several zines (including GRAUSTARK) and they finally gave me a free hand. Presently, the games played by my pupils are recorded in la guerre en dontelles, a wockly of which you've already got the first issue. At the year's end, there will even be Diplomacy examinations (which, fortunately, will not be taken into account for the awarding of degrees...). As you can see, after the first Dippyzine in French (Moeshoeshoe), the first bilingual Dippyzine (On les aura), the first Dippyconvention in Europe (Agathacon 1) and more than 50 Dippyplayers for 10 million inhabitants, Belgium is still at the Dippytop.

JOHN PIGGOTT, Jesus College, Cambridge CB5 8BL, England [20 November 1972]: I've been meaning to write to you for some time, about a letter... which appeared in GRAUSTARK #269... The questioner was a fairly new reader who enquired, whether you edited press releases submitted by players in your games. He said, "I submitted some press releases to so-and-so's zine, and he edited them. I didn't send him any more after that." (Paraphrased).

Well, you replied that you didn't, I think (and if I could find one of Herb Baronts' press releases in GRAUSTARK #275 I'd be sure). However, this roused me a little, because, you see, I do edit press releases submitted to me (in common with, to my knowledge, most other British zines) because it seems the natural course to take. After all, Ethil is my zine; I'm footing the bill (since it still doesn't quite break even) and if I can't put what I want into it I think it's a pretty poor show. So I correct, as best I'm able, the various grammatical and spelling errors in the releases as they are submitted. Where I feel a punch-line could have been brought off a bit better, I don't hesitate to re-write it. If a release is just plain dull ("The Sultan of Turkey has seen fit to declare war on the Emperor Franz Josef of Austria-Hungary after his unwarranted attack on Greece") then I don't print it - as simple as that. More often, I will not print a person's press release because there's no room on the page - I like to keep games all on one page if possible, though usually I try to make it work out fairly evenly. If I've heard a more than usually sickening joke somewhere, I write a press release myself including the joke and put it in.

Needless to say, I boob a lot. But I think that the overall effect is better for my editing than it would be if I didn't play at cons. And people still send me press releases - more than I can print, every issue. I don't know who it was that wrote the letter I referred to, but he seems a peculiar sort of chap if he thinks he writes perfect press releases.

[Granted, some of the press releases printed in GRAUSTARK are of no particularly high quality. But, if encouraged to write them, players sometimes get off press releases that "interlock" with each other,

as happened particularly well in 1966AA. Something of the sort may be working up in 1971EC, but Barents is not providing sufficient "competition" for Lipton, and the sheer volume of Lipton's releases is producing space problems.

[I try to get press releases published no later than one issue after the one at which they are aimed. They generally get put on stencil well in advance of the publication date, so that a press release that arrives less than one week before the publication date stands a very good chance of getting postponed.

[And if press releases are cut too badly, or ignored, they soon won't be elicited - and the better press release writers will take their production elsewhere.]

Now. Who is Bangs Leslie Tapscott, I ask you. And this time, don't chicken out of it by referring me to your colophon. I already know what Bangs Leslie Tapscott doesn't do; I want to know who he is. (And don't say he's the ruler of Craven-on-the-Puddle, either.)

[Bangs Leslie Tapscott is believed to be alive and well in a cave in the Desert of Deseret, where he spends most of his time with his back to the entrance, watching his complete set of Platonic Ideals. According to his Lawyers, Hylas & Philonous, this collection will eventually be willed to the Academy for Trivial and Quadrivial Studies in Wogastisburg-Schlampenbüttel.]

Some time ago you asked me how long copies of Graustark take to reach here. It's hard to give an exact figure because of dock strikes and such, but recently they've been taking 30 to 35 days. I find fanzines mailed from California take much the same time to arrive. I wish I knew how our respective Post Offices manage to take so long...and why it doesn't take twice as long from California, which my atlas assures me is about twice as far away as New York.

[All European readers receive Graustark by 3rd-class mail. I would like to hear from other European readers on how long their copies take to reach them - and also from readers in the American colonies in the western Pacific.]

DAVID G. CRESSEY, Apt. 22, 1140 Commonwealth Ave., Allston, Mass. 02134 [27 November 1972]. Yes, the election is over, and those of us who felt that McGovern would make a better president than Nixon are, to say the least, chagrined. I have kept silent throughout the campaign, at least in the Dippy world, noting that my arguments usually do my position more harm than good, but I think it is now time for me to question your position that sitting out an election is better than getting involved.

You are not the only one who has been forced to recognize that your faith in liberal democrats in the early sixties was way out of proportion. Most of us have. I viewed Kennedy as the lesser of two evils in '60, but was pleasantly surprised by his performance in at least two areas. First, his assumption of presidential responsibility and accountability for acts of "the administration" was a refreshing change from the Eisenhower years. ("I wasn't aware of that." - Ike) Second, he did take the first significant step toward easing cold war tensions with the test ban treaty. From there on out, I am probably as disgusted as you are at the dullness and stupidity of "the best and the brightest". I blame this on several things, but these stand out: The two party system. Comment by someone from a country that has many parties: "two is only one more than one". The institutionalization of "anti-Communism". The real adversaries of the "anti-Communists" (Nixon included) never were Communists but liberal ideas and values. I believe this forced liberals to take a more aggressive stance abroad so that the right wing could not cry "Communism" when they proposed such measures as Medicare. Third, the enthroning of the candidate rather than support for his position on the issues. This would lead to bad poli-

tics in any era, but is particularly dangerous in this one as long as the vogue (or conspiracy) of political assassinations continues.

I realize that you and I differ on our assessments concerning McGovern's actual position on the issues, particularly Vietnam, but I feel that it is better to elect a man who has come around to the correct view, than to elect one who has not.

You and I agreed about one thing, though. The "imminent end of the war" has been clarified, partially, by the end of the election season. We at least have a minimum estimate: "Four more years".

[I saw no reason in McGovern's background, or on his stand concerning potential Vietnams elsewhere in the world, that would produce confidence in his willingness or ability to bring peace.

[And as for "liberal": Frequently readers have characterized me or my views as "liberal". I resent that. "Liberal" means people like Lyndon Johnson. It means the people who planned and made the Vietnam war. It doesn't mean me.

[During the Truman administration, liberals engaged in the same anti-Communism. It isn't anything they were "forced" to do - given a chance, liberals are quite as capable as conservatives of fanatical anti-Communist bogosity.]

DONALD E. STEHLE, 20 Devon St., Malverne, N. Y. 11565 [5 December 1972]: This letter is in reply to your article "Ptolemaic Politics", which appeared in the 2 December 1972 issue of GRAUSTARK. [#279] I would take exception to the remark, "If people like my colleague taught instead about the way this country actually is governed, rather than about unrealistic abstractions in a centuries-old document, their students would be less likely to throw their lives away."

Such drivel I would expect from a freshman, not from an individual whose role it is to instruct these immature minds in the complex patterns surrounding us. You have shown a complete misjudgment of the purpose of "an elementary course in American political theory", the purpose of theory itself, and lastly, the place of political thought in the total fabric of our society.

The purpose of any elementary course is merely to introduce some of the basic concepts to which the subject can be addressed, not to overwhelm the student with all the complex relationships which may be present in reality. While an initial study of a subject may not answer all the pressing questions concerned, it most certainly provides a beginning, from which progress can be made by adding to the foundation initially built.

Of much greater importance to myself is your disregard for the word theory in your colleague's subject. The main theme of your article completely ignores both the definition and purpose of the word. A theory is necessarily an abstraction, one which is made with assumptions in order to isolate specific factors which the theorist holds as most relevant to the problem at hand. It does not provide solutions; indeed, if it were used correctly, there is no possibility that any theory in the world could be applied to an actuality. Theory can only help in indicating which facts are relevant, what some of the social choices must be, and what are the requirements of the institutional arrangements. Given the restrictions (assumptions which are made), a theory is really only as good as its correct explanation of the reality. Now you may argue that present political theory does not adequately explain the reality of the realworld structure found, and to this I agree you are correct. But again I remind you that elementary theory is a far cry from what more educated people would use.

In my studies of economics, I began with some of the most simplistic economic models, ones which really bear no relationship at all to the real world, but as I progressed, I was introduced to more advanced models, ones which began to simulate in their small way, real world situations. It

would have been foolhardy, to say the least, to have begun with those sophisticated theories when I lacked the proper foundation on which to build. It would have been even more foolish to begin with what was actually to be found, inasmuch as I had no idea of what relationships and factors might be most important. This brings me to my last criticism of your misuse of the phrase "elementary course in American political theory".

To say the least, a course such as this does not address itself to the complex relationships found in real world politics. To say that the course is irrelevant is simply not fair, even if the course were of an advanced nature. Such topics as the real world complexities of political parties, the Cabinet, the media, the congressional committee structure, and the oligarchies [shouldn't this word be singular?] referred to as "the Establishment", "the Military-Industrial Complex", and "the Insiders" deal with considerably more than merely political theory or actuality. Since they in essence are topics of man's relationship with his fellow man, they are part of all the social sciences and not to be adequately explained by any combination which excludes some.

In conclusion let me state that students who "throw their lives away" because of the alleged irrelevance of their political science course are guilty of the saying, "A little bit of knowledge is dangerous", in more ways than their immaturity of political thought is concerned.

Thank you for your attention.

[It appears that the term "theory" has a vastly different meaning in the social sciences from its use in the physical sciences. In the physical sciences, a "theory" is a summation, in concise form, of a large amount of experiment and observation. It is reached by inductive processes.

"Theory", in the social sciences, apparently means the formal system to which society is nominally committed, rather than the actual rules governing its operation. I can recall, as an undergraduate, reading an introduction to formal capitalistic economics assuming a large number of competing businesses in continual competition with each other, an approach which gave little or no attention to the fact that, in each line of business, there are really only a few large firms which cooperate with each other far more than they compete. Socialism was similarly oversimplified.

[In elementary courses in the sciences, we sometimes present such now rejected ideas as the geocentric planetary system, the caloric theory of heat, or the phlogiston theory of combustion. These are not presented, as Stehle would present elementary social science, as "an abstraction... made with assumptions in order to isolate specific factors". They are presented as incorrect views of the universe, which were once accepted because of inadequate evidence or incorrect approaches to the subject.

[The social sciences still seem to be in a phase which the physical sciences abandoned long ago. Once someone could say, "The earth is the center of the universe - I have an ancient document which says so." Or he could say, "Man is unrelated to other animals - I have an ancient document which says so." Scientists no longer do this. But social scientists are still saying, "The individual has rights enforceable against the state - I have an ancient document which says so."

If, as Stehle says, "a theory is really only as good as its correct explanation of the reality", then American political theory with its reference to the Constitution needs serious revision. Where the Constitution sees three branches of government with approximately coequal powers, the actuality is a virtual dictatorship of the Executive Branch, with the others functioning in an advisory capacity if at all. The subjects of war, of individual rights, of freedom of speech, press, and association, of trial procedure, of private interests interlocked with the government's, of extra-governmental seats of power - all differ vastly from what the

Constitution and laws say they are.

In comparison with the British system would be instructive. In theory, the Queen has immense personal power. She can refuse assent to bills in Parliament, she can "dispense" her subjects from complying with those laws, she has supreme command of the armed forces, she can determine what is and what is not orthodoxy in religion, she can run local governments through her appointed Lords Lieutenant, and she can pass out lordships and other dignities as she pleases.

In actual practice she is a figurehead, much as many functionaries of our government have become. The royal assent has not been withheld since the reign of Queen Anne. The other prerogatives have slumbered for nearly as long. If the Queen were to exercise one of them now, it would produce as much shock as would an attempt by Congress to take part in the conduct of war or foreign relations.

If one were to proceed by inductive reasoning from the observed, actual functioning of the United States government, one would reach a far different sort of political theory than the theory, based on a Constitution now functionally obsolete, which is taught in American schools and universities now.

[Mind you, I'm not saying this is a good thing. I dislike it strongly. I have no doubt that there were, in the 17th century, astronomers who disliked the heliocentric model of the planetary system. But the facts are stubbornly and unarguable there.]

MARK MURRAY, Box 1706, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass. 01610

[9 December 1972] What happens in the following situations:

RUSSIA: A Mos-Ukr; A St-P-Mos.

1. TURKEY: A Sov-Mos; A Ukr-S A Sov-Mos.

2. TURKEY: A Ukr-Mos; A Sov-S A Ukr-Mos.

In the first case, the Turkish attack would succeed. The Russian A Ukr would be dislodged and forced to retreat. In the second case, the same thing happens. The Russian "A Mos-Ukr" cannot cut the support given by the Turkish A Ukr to an attack into Moscow.

JAMES A. W. FITCHIE, Box 878, Killarney, Manitoba R0K 1G0 [8 January 1973]: I am currently sitting in my living room with my typewriter balanced on my knees, accompanied by two friends of mine, Gord Powell and Greg Clark...watching a CBC special on the Vietnam War.

After a while, and numerous nasty expletives about the American military and (I am afraid) Americans in general, delivered in English, Ga-lic, and sign language, Greg mentioned to me that anybody living in the US would have a hard time staying sane. (Excuse me. Nixon has just stated how lucky college students are, after scenes from Kent State were flashed on the screen, and I must swear a little at the TV screen.)

...Anyway, I mentioned you and your pacifism, and your opposition to the war. (Though only one copy of GRAUSTARK comes to Killarney it's widely read among the Wards) Greg suggested, and Gord concurred, and what choice did I have then, that we send a letter of sympathy to you, for having the guts and the intelligence, and the strength to be able to survive as a sane man in America today.

We don't figure that we're totally innocent. Some of those bombs dropping are probably Canadian.

Maybe you could organize a fund through postal diplomacy, to send money to North Vietnam for medical supplies etc.? Or maybe send medical supplies?

Go sahaba Dia sinn!

[There is a fund now for the rebuilding of Bach Mai Hospital, which was completely destroyed by American bombers on 19 and 22 December 1972. Send your contributions to Bach-Mai Hospital Emergency Relief Fund, Medical Aid for Indochina, 140 6th St., Cambridge, Mass. 02142. Or you could

(continued on pg. 12)

9

THE END OF ARGUMENT

In the Thousand and One Nights is the tale of a long debate between two scholars, a man and a woman. The woman, represented as extremely learned in philosophy and theology, was entertaining the man with Moslem propriety, being seated behind a screen during their conversation. From this point of observation she sees her guest, a revered elder, casting fish-eyes at her younger brother. "Can it be," she asks him, "that you are one of those men who gives the preference to boys rather than to women?" He replies that he is. The two scholars then proceed to argue the matter, citing the Koran, philosophy, medicine, and folklore in support of their stands. Indeed, the woman speaks so eloquently of the physical attractions of women that the reader may suspect she is a trifle gay herself.

And yet, after all the arguments on both sides, the whole dialog appears quite futile. A person's sexual preferences are not set by a carefully delineated rational argument. They are the product of emotional predilection, set by influences in the individual's background which, at our present state of understanding of psychology, defy causality.

Much the same is true of how one regards the war. Six or eight years ago the prisoners of war held very little place in the Hawks' argument. Now they bulk large, mainly because no other pro-war argument can now be made to sound remotely plausible. Yet, for their alleged benefit, a bombing offensive has been conducted which stiffens the Vietnamese will to resist, alienates American and world public opinion - and increases the number of prisoners.

People regard war or peace as desirable not out of rational considerations, but from deep-felt emotional needs for one or the other of these situations. Some people feel insecure should American domination of world affairs recede. Others, facing a personal inadequacy in everyday life, identify themselves with the immense armed might of the United States of America and thus bolster their self-esteem. Sheer bloodlust seems to hold a great part in the character of pro-war advocates. The coldly rational Hawk who compares the stock market averages before the war with those today, and rejoices therefore, is a decided minority among his fellow war-lovers.

Under these circumstances, argument loses its point. Our attempts to persuade the war-lovers to make peace, are as futile as the attempts of the Moslem lady to persuade her guest that he should screw women instead of boys. We who prefer peace should not argue with Hawks about whether to continue the war, but with each other about what we should do about Hawks. They are not an opposition with whom we debate. They are a problem about which we decide what to do.

There is actually not very much we can do. Repeated comparison of pro-war and anti-war demonstrations indicates that Hawks are a trivial minority. The last such comparison prior to the 1973 Inauguration (still in the future as these pages go to press) took place on 4 January. Rev. Carl McIntire brought 20 pro-war demonstrators to the grounds of the Capitol. Clergy and Laymen Concerned had 400 anti-war demonstrators at the same time and place, holding a memorial service for the Vietnam dead.

However, though the Hawks are numerically negligible, they control the positions which make policy and manufacture public opinion. The press, with very few exceptions, is pro-war. Most governmental and business leaders are pro-war. So is the handful of men entrenched at the top of organized labor, and the even tinier and more remote handful entrenched at the top of organized religion.

Under these circumstances, there is little probability that the war will ever end. The Congressmen who could cut off funds have pro-war records which they will not repudiate by such actions. The media will con-

tinue to represent peace demonstrators as an insignificant number of crackpots, who only got their just deserts when the army kills them. Media America's principal culture heroes will continue to be John Wayne, Archie Bunker, Spiro Agnew, Billy Graham, William Calley, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

However, since the opinions of our majority will make no difference, we can at least indulge ourselves in them. And, since the war will never end, there will never be a great national reconciliation, and we can say what we think of the Hawks without worrying that our words will ever stand in the way of it.

What can we do? We can contribute to the Vietnam Medical Aid Committee. (36 Wellington St., London WC2, England; checks in dollar amounts are perfectly acceptable) We can stop dignifying these war-lovers by replying to what they consider to be "arguments". We can cut off social and perhaps even economic contacts with these bloodthirsty beasts. If they are authors, we need not buy their books. If they are job-seekers, we need not hire them. If they are shopkeepers, we need not patronize them. If they are candidates, we need not vote for them. If they are welcome in the homes of our friends, we may assume that we are not.

Marsh? Well, these people want war, with all that that means. Personally, I have never shoved parts of a child into a sack, but I have talked to people who have. No one has a right to tell me that there are things to which this is preferable. The advocate of war is the advocate of a direct personal threat to all of us. Their words and deeds present a personal danger to all of us.

We don't have to put up with it.

NEW BLOOD (continued from the previous issue)

There was insufficient space in GRAUSTARK #282 to list the names of all the newcomers to war-gaming fandom who have written in for information. Also, several new people who have written in since then must be included. The following list is complete to 15 January 1973. Supplements will appear in future issues. This list is by ZIP code, so that players in the same vicinity may get in touch with one another.

- Stephen W. Hall, 747 Watertown St., Newton, Mass. 02160
- Mark Hurwitz, 396 Meisel Ave., Springfield, N. J. 07081
- Bill Sippo, 1108 Central Ave., Union City, N. J. 07087
- Bill Sullivan, 326 Heights Rd., Ridgewood, N. J. 07450
- Ens. Jerry S. Stodman, USS Albany (CG-10), FPO New York, N. Y. 09501
- John Beaderstadt, Cost Guard Dispensary, Governors Island, N. Y. 10004
- Tom Geiger, 24 Hilltop Rd., Port Washington, N. Y. 11050
- Kevin Kenney, 122 Bayswater Rd., Inwood, N. Y. 11696
- Wallace Michael Kotyk, 617 Wright Park Manor, Rome, N. Y. 13441
- Robin R. A. Smith, 556 Garden Village Dr., Apt. 1, Cheektowaga, N. Y.
- John W. Bowling, Dept. of Social Sciences, Troy (14227)

State University, Troy, Ala. 36081	This is
Stevon Blackstad, 5752 Bufield Ave., Encino, Calif. 91316	
Sam Jones, 3514 Cody Rd., Sherman Oaks, Calif. 91403	O At
Charles G. Muhle, 1424 Alpha Pl., Anaheim, Calif. 92085	P Great
M. Meisel, 6921 Wallsey Dr., San Diego, Calif. 92119	E Intervals
Mike Ritter, 322 West J St., Brawley, Calif. 92227	R This
Richard L. Hull, Apt. 2, 4720 Cloyne, Oxnard, Calif. 93030	A Appears
William A. Clark, 405B Verducci Hall, 770 Lake Merced Blvd., San Francisco, Calif. 94132	T To
Jeffrey Carroll, 57 - 1 Maine St., Travis AFB, Calif. 94535	I Inflame
Kenneth O'Day, #3, 6426 Bonaveno Ave., Oakland, Calif. 94618	O Optic
J. Scott Shearer, 5652 Oak Grove Ave., Oakland, Calif. 94618	N Nerves
David Nasatir, 1540 Summit Rd., Berkeley, Calif. 94708	# 539

James R. Conroy, 22 Tracy Drive, Vacaville, Calif. 95688
 David Darden, 107-36-9245, PO Box 189, Mym Vietnam, APO San Francisco, Calif. 96203
 David C. Warhoit, TID, US Embassy, Seoul, Korea, APO San Francisco, Calif. 96301
 Capt. Ralph B. Palmer, Box 211, PSG #1, APO San Francisco, Calif. 96553
 Alan M. Artman, P. O. Box 294, Bandon, Ore. 97411
 Kevin E. Thorne, 1134 Marguerite Ave., Bremerton, Wash. 98310
 Frederick J. Chartrand, Box 99, Nolton, Wash. 98566
 Robert J. Spencer, #5, 100 W. Pine St., Shelton, Wash. 98584
 Dean Denis, Apt. 106, 460 Des Chartres St., Laval des Rapides, Quebec
 Paul T. L. Chan, 20 Cable Pl., Scarborough, Ontario M1P 4J8
 Gassy Bruya, #205, 132 Wellington St. S., Hamilton, Ontario
 John Hulland, RR #4, Guelph, Ontario N1H 6J1
 David C. Holmes, Apt. 21, 145 Connaught Ave., London 25, Ontario
 Leo W. G. Nichorster, 6450 Hanau/Main, Menzelstrasse 36, German Federal Republic

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY

The Pacifist majority should never forget the many men and women of the armed forces who have at great personal risk done their bit to end the war. The time is long past when it was automatically assumed that every wearer of a uniform supported the war. If the war ever is ended, it will be ended because the Navy and the Air Force refuse to fight, as the Army has already refused. It would be grimly ironic if the United States of America, saved in the 1940's because its armed forces fought, would be saved once again in the 1970's because its armed forces refused to fight.

Some readers in the military have wondered whether my pacifistic strictures apply to them. No - a soldier, even an officer, must like every other person be judged on his personal views. Between the overt conscription and the more covert pressures exerted by the "tracking" system, almost all people in the armed forces have been forced in.

I have two relatives who received orders for Vietnam in the past couple of years - during a period when the war was allegedly "winding down". Fortunately, neither of them is there now. A cousin was sent to Morocco (.) instead: the Sultan needs propping up against a rebel movement that nearly shot his head out from under his fez a couple of years ago. And my brother was on the Kitty Hawk - and, thanks to the riot, was able to spend a totally unexpected Christmas home with his family.

Incidentally, I am not personally acquainted with any Hawks who have or had people out there! *

GRAUSTARK, the oldest bulletin of postal Diplomacy, is published on alternate Saturdays by John Boardman, 234 E. 19th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11236. Subscriptions are 8 issues for \$1; back issues are 15¢ each or 10 issues for \$1. (Overseas subscriptions are 5 issues for \$1 or 12 for £1; back issues are 10 for \$1 or 24 for £1.) No new games are currently being organized. This publication is not edited under the supervision of Bangs Leslie Tapscott. *

"I must commend the Nixon Administration for its recommendation that the death penalty be invoked in cases involving the bombing of public buildings. I'm sure that the doctors and patients of the Hanoi hospital that was destroyed in this manner last month would also endorse this forthright proposal, if they could." Jack Rogers, letter, New York Post, 9 January 1973 *

I was sorry to hear of Lyndon Johnson's death last Monday. I had hoped to see him hanged for war crimes.

Just in case all branches of the armed forces refuse to fight against the Vietnamese, the President has one resource in preparation. Since at least 1969, nuclear weapons assembly technicians have been stationed in Vietnam. (Chilsea News, 22 Feb. 1968) And a new Nixon appointee, questioned by a senatorial committee, said that as Deputy Secretary of Defense he would not rule out the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam. (New York Times, 12 Jan. 1973) Though William P. Clements Jr. was hastily overruled by his superiors, suspicion of their veracity is of old well-founded.

No matter how many airmen refuse to fly bombing missions, a crew could always be scraped up to drop a hydrogen bomb on Hanoi. The whole tendency of Nixon's Vietnam policy is in this direction.

THE DIPLOMATIC POUCH (continued from p. 8)

send money to the London-based organization described on p. 11.

[I don't know how "sane" a resident of America might be described as at this time. We are caught between a moral imperative to oppose the war, and the practical fact that opponents of the war show a distressing tendency to get shot. Many people who once went out and demonstrated are now inclined to slam the door on this dilemma and go about their own concerns. On looking over three- and four-year-old issues of GRAUSTARK, I find statements of optimism that seem bitterly laughable today. I thank you for your good wishes, but I fear that I've copped out too.]

BOB LIPTON, McKeon Hall, Box 360, Lafayette College, Easton, Penn. 18042: In addendum to my article on southern stalemate positions [in #282]: In Section III. you have listed Rumania as a supply center twice. Since Rome is not a southern supply center...one of those 'Rum's' should be struck out.

Section III, Position #1 was miswritten. The supply centers should also have Sov, and the units & moves should read: A Sov, A Rum, A Vie, A Ven, A Rom & F Ion hold, F Bla S A Sov; A Bul S A Rum; A Bud & A Tri S A Vie; A Apu & F Adr S A Ven; A Nap S A Rom; F Arg S F Ion. The variation that goes into the Tyrrhenian is: Change F Arg to F Tyr and have it hold; then turn A Rom & A Nap to fleets, and have F Ion, F Nap & F Rom S F Tyr.

GRAUSTARK #283

John Beardman
234 East 19th Street
Brooklyn, New York 11226
U. S. A.

F I R S T C L A S S M A I L

"Tactical atomic explosives are now conventional and will be used against the military targets of any aggressive force." — Richard M. Nixon